



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

race." Consequently he thinks that harm was done by those enthusiastic post-bellum missionaries who almost persuaded many negroes that they were, for all practical purposes, white. "The white man is right when he insists that a black man cannot be a white man, but wrong when he insists that *all* men are white. The Negro who does not accept the first proposition is a fool; but the Negro who accepts the second is both a fool and a menace." It is evident that the author has no respect for race fusion as a solution of the race problem.

There is in this work very little of the conventional belaboring of slavery and glorification of the reconstruction. Exception, however, may be taken to the statement that in the gulf states it was cheaper to work a slave to death than to treat him decently and to the credit given to the educational system of reconstruction. Emancipation succeeded, he says, "because it was accepted in good faith by the slave holders" but "enfranchisement and reconstruction [failed because] they were not accepted in good faith and were never fairly tried."

A proper solution of the problem will result finally, Dr. Roman believes, in a racial comity, a bi-racial democracy. There will be no confusion of the "rights of life with privilege of place." The negro will work with, not against, the white man and he will expect the latter not to fear him, but to be just and sympathetic, to concede to him the right to stay on the earth, "to cease parading universal human failures as peculiar negro vices," and to aid him in his evolution toward the standards already achieved by the whites.

WALTER L. FLEMING

Our military history. Its facts and fallacies. By Leonard Wood, major general, U. S. army. (Chicago: Reilly and Britton company, 1916. 240 p. \$1.00 net)

The popular idea that its geographical position makes the United States immune from attack and the confidence of the American people in their ability to repel a world in arms, if need be, are due in large measure to the textbooks used in school and college. The authors, either from ignorance or a false conception of patriotism, leave the impression that we have always been easily victorious in war. This tradition of invincibility has affected the minds even of our responsible statesmen and makes it difficult for professional opinion to get a hearing. General Wood's book is designed to eradicate mischievous misconceptions in this connection. In four brief chapters he reviews the history of our several wars, pointing out the slipshod methods used in raising armies; the fearful loss of life and treasure due to lack of organization and foresight. The gist of the story is that our conduct of war has been

utterly unscientific and that success has been due to fortunate alliances or to the circumstance that the enemy was even less prepared than we were.

General Wood scouts internationalism in good set terms. Pacifism is "the cant of weaklings," "the rubbish and cant of the fainthearted." Pacifist principles are "the theories and policies of addled minds and shallow intelligences, products of the applause of the lecture platform, or of minds upset by the flattery incident to sudden wealth." He does not believe that arbitration will take the place of force until human nature shall have undergone a complete change (pp. 33, 45). He has no confidence in any proposed league to enforce peace, though admitting that this is an open question (37); systems of alliances to preserve the balance of power have commonly only led to war, though sometimes bringing considerable periods of quiet (38); peace treaties and international law will not stand the strain of great crises (52); nations are engaged in a struggle for existence, in which the fittest in military preparation will survive (34). General Wood has plainly come under the influence of German thought.

The only hope we have to withstand the attack of a first-class power lies in the speedy establishment of a system of compulsory military service under some such system as that of Switzerland or Australia (193-213). There must be a standing army large enough to defend the coast and to protect our outlying possessions; but the main reliance must be on the great body of citizens, organized, drilled, and equipped by the federal authority. The volunteer principle must go as being wholly undemocratic and unfair; and state control must be given up, since it has always entailed endless confusion and inefficiency.

The last chapter is an excellent sketch of the constructive work of the army, relating the services of army engineers and sanitation experts in Cuba, Panama, and other outlying territories.

An appendix gives a description of the Australian and Swiss systems of compulsory service.

This book makes no contribution to the history of the nation. The facts have been taken from Upton's *Military policy of the United States* and from the various studies of F. L. Huidekoper. The book was written purely for propagandist purposes. The author is intolerant of opposition and his tone throughout is Rooseveltian.

R. P. BROOKS